

REMARKS

The Applicants thank the Examiner for the consideration given the present application. Claims 6 and 11 were previously cancelled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter thereof. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-10, and 12-22 are pending. Claims 1 and 8-10 are amended, and claims 14-22 are added. Claims 1, 8, and 17 are independent. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein.

Examiner Interview

If, during further examination of the present application, a discussion with the Applicants' Representative would advance the prosecution of the present application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Carl T. Thomsen, Registration No. 50,786, at 1-703-208-4030 (direct line) at his convenience.

Information Disclosure Citation

An Information Disclosure Statement is being filed concurrently.

Amendments to the Specification

The second full paragraph on page 20 of the specification has been amended merely to correct a typographical error, namely to replace the wording "a ring-shaped end face 18R" with the wording "to a ring-shaped end face 18F." Reference character 18F is properly illustrated in Replacement Drawing FIG. 4 filed on September 16, 2009. No new matter has been added.

Objection to the Drawings

The Examiner has objected to drawings alleging that reference character 18R is not illustrated in the drawings. As mentioned above, reference character 18R has been cancelled from the specification. Thus, the drawings are believed to be in proper condition.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-10, 12, and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner has set forth certain instances wherein the claim language lacks antecedent basis.

In order to overcome this rejection, the Applicants have amended claims 1 and 8-10 to correct each of the deficiencies specifically pointed out by the Examiner. The Applicants respectfully submit that the claims, as amended, particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as the invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-10, 12, and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Nishiyama et al. (U.S. 2002/0140225).

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Once again, the Applicants point out that the Examiner has made no comments whatsoever about the subject presented in any of the dependent claims, as is required.

Amendments to Independent Claims 1 and 8

While not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to advance prosecution of the instant application, each of **independent claims 1 and 8** has been amended herein to recite a combination of elements directed to a resin tube-equipped quick connector, including *inter alia*

“wherein the connector body has a generally tubular shape as a whole, and has a retainer holding portion adapted to receive and hold the C-shaped retainer in an axial opening at one axial end thereof ...

wherein the retainer holding portion includes first and second (box-shaped) windows opening through opposite curved sides thereof,

wherein the C-shaped retainer includes a first arc-shaped portion which projects outwardly into the first window of the retainer holding portion, and a second arc-shaped portion which projects outwardly into the second window of the retainer holding portion.”

Support for the novel features of **independent claims 1 and 8**, as amended, can be found, for example, in FIGS. 2 and 3 of the original application.

Regarding the Nishiyama et al. Reference

FIG. 3 of this document merely illustrates retainer 22 with a single projection extending into a groove on one inner side of the quick connector 5. Paragraph [0047] of this document fails to provide description whatsoever of the configuration of retainer 22.

JMS/CTT/ktp

Thus, Nishiyama et al. cannot teach or suggest the combination of elements now set forth in each of **independent claims 1 and 8**.

While not used in the rejection of the claims in the Office Action, the previously cited Ostrander et al. and Bock references are discussed merely to demonstrate that no combination of Ostrander et al. and Bock can make up for the deficiency of Nishiyama et al. teach or suggest the combination of elements now set forth in each of **independent claims 1 and 8**.

Regarding the Ostrander et al. Reference

This document merely discloses U-shaped retainer 10 received in side aperture 49, having a pair of legs 64, 66 with hooked outer ends 72 extending into aperture 51. (See FIGS. 1 and 3.)

Regarding the Bock Reference

This document merely discloses an arresting device 6 having two outer parts 29 fitted over the outside of sleeve 5. (See FIS. 8 and 10.)

At least for the reasons explained above, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of elements as set forth in each of **independent claims 1 and 8** is not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record, including Nishiyama et al., Ostrander et al. and Bock.

Therefore, **independent claims 1 and 8** are in condition for allowance.

Added Independent Claim 17

While not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to advance prosecution of the instant application, **independent claim 17** has been amended herein to recite a combination of elements directed to a coupling structure for a quick connector and a resin tube for connecting a fuel-transporting resin tube to a mating pipe, including *inter alia*

wherein the resin tube is a small-diameter tube having an inner diameter of not larger than 5 mm,

a press-fit undergoing portion into which the press-fitting portion is press-fitted is beforehand expanded in tube diameter by a beforehand-heated diameter-enlarging pin prior to the press fitting, and

the press-fitting portion is press-fitted into the tube diameter-expanded press-fit undergoing portion to be integrated with the press-fitting portion in a withdrawal-preventing condition.

The Applicants respectfully submit that no combination of Nishiyama et al., Ostrander et al. and Bock can teach or suggest the subject matter set forth in added **independent claim 17**.

Thus, independent claim 17 is in condition for allowance.

Dependent Claims

The Examiner will note that dependent claims 9 and 10 have been amended to place them in better form, dependent claims 14 and 15 have been added to set forth subject matter previously contained in claims 1 and 8, and dependent claims 16 and 18-22 have been added to set forth additional novel features of the present invention.

All dependent claims are in condition for allowance due to their dependency from allowable independent claims, or due to the additional novel features set forth therein.

As mentioned above, during the prosecution of this application from April 9, 2008 to-date, in the four Office Actions issued by the USPTO, the Examiner has failed to make any mention of his reasons for rejecting the dependent claims.

If the Examiner continues to reject the dependent claims of this application, he is respectfully requested to provide specific evidence of how the cited references teach or suggest the subject matter of each of the rejected dependent claims, as is required by USPTO Rules.

All pending claims are now in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION


All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and that the present application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, he is invited to telephone Carl T. Thomsen (Reg. No. 50,786) at (703) 208-4030 (direct line).

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17, particularly extension of time fees.

Dated: February 25, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By 
James M. Slattery

Registration No.: 28,380
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant